

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. III, No. 12

P.O. Box 21123, Washington, D.C. 20009

June 15, 1973

R&D "Crisis"? It's Not Worrying the Administration

Summer settles in on Washington with Mr. Nixon preoccupied with dodging the sherrif, the economy registering an alarming fever, and, sorry to report, no one of any great influence sensitive to the maladies and missed opportunities of that small subdivision known as the scientific community.

High within the administration, one of the newcomers responsible for looking after scientific affairs ruminated with SGR for an off-the-record-hour or so the other day about his jurisdiction, but in substance had little to say other than: (1) "the scientists" are unhappy because they think they're not getting enough money, and some more might be forthcoming for energy research; (2) they're also unhappy because of "lack of recognition," and this might be attended to by handing out some

long overdue federal medals for research and maybe by bringing more scientists onto highlevel ad hoc committees. But he emphasized that he wasn't certain that anything resembling (1) or (2) might happen soon or even at all.

"The problem," he said, "is that we've had too much stop and go in government dealings with the universities and research, and this has led to a lot of disruptions and periods of adjustment that have been rougher than need have been."

He added that the growth of scientific activity throughout the 1960s was "fantastic," and that "given the number of people we have in the pipeline, there's a terrific problem. But there's nothing dramatic and spectacular to be done, and

(Continued on page 2)

HEW Aide Sees Peer System Surviving but with Changes

Charles C. Edwards, assistant secretary for health in HEW, continues to make reassuring noises about the administration's attitude toward peer review as practiced at NIH and NIMH.

In an effort to allay fears in the biomedical community that the administration is on the verge of dismantling the existing peer review mechanism, Edwards has told reporters and NIH leaders that the system may be changed, but it will not be abandoned. Late last month Edwards elaborated on this theme before the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists meeting in Miami.

"Our efforts to make a thorough and overdue evaluation of our use of advisory committees has been interpreted by some as the beginning of the end of research grant peer review at the National Institutes of Health," he said. "Nothing could be further from the truth.

"The system of peer review developed over the years at NIH is an invaluable tool—perhaps the only effective one—for determining the merit of innovative scientific research proposals and the competence of the people who make them. But this is not to say that the system is perfect and inviolate. It is quite possible that ways can be found to make the system work better. And if they can, we want to take advantage of them. Our purpose is not to do away with peer review, but to strengthen it."

In Brief

Even when far removed from the Watergate scandal, service high up in the Nixon administration has now come to be regarded of such doubtful career value that recruiters are going far down their lists of choices to fill vacancies. The problem isn't merely the possibility of taint by association; there's also the question of whether anything can be accomplished in the present atmosphere of spreading scandal.

And even some of the latest appointees have their anxieties. Newly appointed AEC Commissioner William E. Kriegsman has privately told friends that because of Watergate, he considered pulling out between nomination by Nixon last April and confirmation by the Senate, but feared that the move might be misinterpreted to suggest that he was forced out because he had something to do with Watergate.

The Ford Foundation, noting a 33 per cent decline in government support for arms control research, is providing \$4.5 million for such research in universities and various think tanks. Ford says the object is to revive scholarly interest in the field and produce a new generation of arms control researchers.

David Davies, a Cambridge University seismologist who has been working at MIT since 1970, has been appointed editor of *Nature*, succeeding John Maddox, who has resigned to pursue his own publishing and writing ventures.

U.S., Yugoslavia Finally Settle On Research Funding

Loudly touted plans for a major expansion of US-supported research in Yugoslavia have been scaled down considerably following the discovery that the US holds far less surplus currency there than was originally believed (SGR Vol. III, No. 12).

Last year, following an exchange of goodwill visits by Presidents Nixon and Tito, it was announced that the US would increase the release of Public Law 480 funds for cooperative research programs in Yugoslavia from some \$7 million a year to approximately \$20 million. The funds, which pile up from the sale of surplus agricultural products, were viewed as a Godsend by Yugoslav researchers, whose government doesn't spend much more than that amount in support of R&D. And since the programs were to be cooperative in nature, not a few American researchers were looking forward to the professional and personal pleasures of face-to-face association with Yugoslav colleagues.

Then it was discovered that the bookkeepers had erred and that only \$3 million to \$4 million worth of surplus funds were available for research.

Now after nearly a year of negotiations, it's been decided that the US is in a position to make available a lump contribution of \$7.3 million in surplus funds, that this will be matched by the Yugoslavs—though in ongoing appropriations rather than a single payment—and that the joint sum will be expended on cooperative research projects over the next four or five years. The new funds will be both for new projects and to continue work that is currently supported by PL 480 money in the fields of health, environment, urban problems, and agriculture. According to US officials, the \$7.3 million is the end of the line for support financed with PL 480 funds. After that's gone, US agencies may possibly join up with Yugoslav researchers on projects of joint interest, as they do with other nations, but a wideranging cooperative effort is not in the cards.

CRISIS (continued from page 1)

the problems run deeper than the location of scientific advice—a reference to the abolition of the White House Office of Science and Technology, effective July 1, and the assignment of many of its functions to the Director of the National Science Foundation, H. Guyford Stever. As for the effects of Watergate: "It's slowed everything down," he conceded, but with the restaffing of the White House now accomplished, the paperflow has returned to near normal and "we're getting decisions." In connection with this, he pointed out, Roy Ash, director of the Office of Management and Budget, has emerged with power and influence far beyond the substantial amount that naturally accompanies that OMB post, and that to an extent that is not generally realized, Ash and his OMB staff have flowed into the vacuum created by the exodus of Nixon's original White House staff.

"We're in close and continuing touch with Roy and his staff about everything, including R&D," SGR was advised, but it became clear that virtually all references to R&D were actually references to energy R&D. The reason, of course, is that with the elimination of OST, the Defense Department has been relieved of outside scientific and technical meddling in its R&D affairs; NASA has been so chopped down financially and committed to a few longrange and expensive projects, such as Skylab and the space shuttle, that there is little opportunity to intrude there, and the management and direction of biomedical research has been exclusively consigned to the mercies of HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger and his cost/effectiveness team-

mates. So, what's mainly left is the politically sensitive issue of energy, over which the White House has assumed authority. Any increase in energy research expenditures will be concentrated on coal gasification, it was explained. "The coal is available and the time horizon for results is the shortest of any options."

What about conservation of energy through such means as taxing of horsepower? Answer: "That would have enormous ramifications for industry and we don't want to get into that without knowing more about it."

Finally it was explained, "Look, we don't see any really serious problems. No one's been coming here and complaining. We hear about the medical people complaining about traineeships and fellowships. Well, that's something that will have to be worked out. It's part of the adjustment problem of having grown too fast."

"Science policy matters are in the hands of Guy Stever over at NSF. It's up to him to come to us if he's got any problems."

How was Stever performing in his new assignment as Science Advisor? "Seems to be doing very well. I agree that he's no ball of fire, but he hasn't made any enemies and seems to get on well with everybody."

While the scientific community resounds with dire forecasts of the consequences of federal spending policies for R&D, as well as complaints over the priorities for using available funds, the view from high up in the administration is that, all things considered, the situation requires no strong or immediate remedies.—DSG

New NIH Chief Pledges Loyalty to Nixon Team

Robert S. Stone, the new director of NIH, plans to be a loyal team player for the Nixon administration but he says he will not hesitate to argue within the administration for policies he believes right.

Stone, a relative unknown whose appointment caused puzzlement and concern in biomedical circles, held his first press conference on May 31 and showed considerable agility in evading questions that sought to pit him against the administration on a variety of health issues.

At one point, Stone stated: "If I'm to be a part of an organization . . . I need to be a responsible member of that organization . . . So I don't think you can expect me to be in open opposition to established policy." He quickly added that he would have "no compunction" about "standing up" for worthwhile programs in internal debates before policy is set, and that he would argue internally in an effort to reverse decisions he considers misguided. "I didn't buy into any specific future," he said.

The press conference was held just two days after the White House officially announced Stone's appointment, so it was not surprising to find that the former dean of medicine and vice president for health sciences at the University of New Mexico had not yet developed firm positions on many health issues.

Indeed, Stone seemed a bit surprised to be holding such a press conference, explaining that it was "the farthest thing from my mind a month ago." That was because the Nixon administration, its mind preoccupied with Watergate and other matters, left the NIH directorship vacant from January until May, before finally rushing in to fill the post.

Stone said he was attending a meeting of an NIH advisory committee in early May when he was contacted by HEW headquarters, was asked if he'd be willing to be a candidate for the NIH directorship, and replied "yes". He was subsequently interviewed by at least five HEW officials, including Secretary Caspar Weinberger, Under Secretary Frank Carlucci, and Assistant Secretary for Health Charles Edwards. He also chatted briefly with a White House staffer whose name he did not recall.

Stone said that he is not coming to the job with any precise plan "for changing direction at NIH" and that he has been given no instructions by the administration on how to carry out his task. But he indicated that he views his job chiefly as an interpreter or translator who can serve as a link between the administration's professional managers and the scientific community. "There are enormous requirements for linkage," he said.

This perception of the role harmonizes with one

of the Administration's chief motives for picking Stone—namely, that he, as an educational administrator rather than a scientist, might steer NIH toward serving a broader constituency than just the scientific community with which it has traditionally identified. (SGR, Vol. III, No. 11).

Stone said that one of his first "translational" jobs will be to make clear to political leaders and the public that investigator-initiated research has goals and objectives and is "not a casual process" in which "a person goes into a laboratory and does what strikes his fancy."

Reporters repeatedly sought to elicit Stone's views on administration policies which are unpopular in the biomedical community, but Stone smilingly apologized for "seeming to dodge issues" and then went on to dodge them.

On the administration's decision to phase out training grants, he said that, if the decision is reopened to further discussion, he will present his belief that training grants have been "very important" in producing a cadre of trained scientists. But he said any decision to reinstate the grants would have to weigh the resources available and the projected needs for scientists. (Robert Berliner, NIH's deputy director for science, was more vigorously partisan—he said that if Congress appropriates money for the training grants, "we'd do our best" to get the administration to change its position and spend the money).

As for the biomedical community's concern that the administration's current review of advisory committees is aimed at eliminating peer review committees, Stone said, "I don't think we ought to panic because questions have been raised." He added that peer review "has stood the test of time" and has "made biomedical science in this country great."

On the question of whether NIH is putting too much money into cancer and heart programs and not enough elsewhere, Stone said he didn't know "what our capability is to spend money wisely in any of these areas." He also said that program balance at NIH "needs to be under continuing review."

As for his reaction to the fact that the NIH directorship has been made a presidential appointment, Stone said that, "if one has real confidence in the democratic process," then one ought to believe that presidential interest in the NIH director "ought to strengthen this office." Stone said that when he talked to the President prior to being appointed, he got the feeling Nixon wanted "a strong NIH and did not regard NIH as either Republican or Democratic."

Report Urges Universities to Re-examine Government Ties

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has recommended that the nation's universities stop performing secret research and stop operating laboratories for the government when such laboratories could be managed as well or better by other agencies.

The Commission has also recommended that federal research funds be held at a steady and adequate level, that such funds be "concentrated on highly productive centers and individuals" rather than dispersed geographically, and that universities start performing services for a broad range of groups instead of simply serving the rich and the powerful.

These and other recommendations are contained in the Commission's latest report, a 107-page document entitled "The Purposes and the Performance of Higher Education in the United States: Approaching the Year 2000." The report, a broad philosophical look at the functions of higher education, was published June 4 by the McGraw-Hill Book Co.

The major thrust of the report was to evaluate how well America's colleges and universities are fulfilling what the Commission deems the five basic functions of higher education. The report card went as follows:

In providing opportunities for the intellectual, aesthetic, ethical, and skill development of individual students, the performance was rated "generally adequate." In advancing human capability in society by developing new ideas and training talent, the performance was rated "superior." In contributing to social justice by improving educational access for minorities and the poor, the record was "unsatisfactory but improving." In transmitting and advancing learning and wisdom, the score was again "superior." And in critical evaluation of society, the record was "quite uneven in the past and uncertain for the future."

The Commission reviewed a number of issues in which there is conflict over higher education's fundamental purposes, and it made 23 recommendations on issues ranging from whether institutions should relax admissions standards for disadvantaged groups to whether they should seek, as institutions, to influence social and political change.

One section of the report suggested that higher education has taken on too many functions—the report identifies 16 "major" ones—with the result that institutions become larger and more complex, with added layers of bureaucracy, and they develop internal contradictions and inefficiencies.

The Commission considered it a "contradiction" when a campus "takes on functions which are at

US-Israeli Foundation to Meet

The 10-member board of the newly established US-Israeli Bi-National Foundation plans to hold its inaugural meeting June 25-26 in Jerusalem to establish operating policies for the \$2-million-a-year granting organization and to settle on the appointment of an executive director.

Chaired by NSF Director H. Guyford Stever, the board is confronted by the Israeli's desire to have one of their top research administrators, Eliezer Tal, executive director of the National Council for Research and Development, handle the directorship post on a part-time basis. Short of manpower as they are, the Israelis apparently see little reason for tying up an experienced administrator full-time on what, after all, is a small enterprise. The US side isn't adamant on the issue, but its preference is to have someone give full attention to the job, as is the practice here.

Supported by Israeli contributions and prepayment of loans owed the US, the Foundation was established to continue the support in Israel of scientific activities that were dependent on a now nearly depleted supply of US-held surplus Israeli currency.

odds with the inherent nature of academic life." It placed "all secret research" in this category because "secrecy is abhorrent to the search for truth when results must be open to analysis and comment to test whether they be truth or not." Consequently, the Commission recommended that "all secret research should be eliminated from all campuses as a matter of national policy, except under quite unusual circumstances."

The Commission further deemed it "inefficient" when a campus "takes on nonacademic operations which can be performed as well or better by other institutions." In this category, the Commission placed the management of large developmental laboratories for the government.

The Commission proposed that each function of a college be subjected to periodic scrutiny to see if it meets two tests: "(1) Is the activity, even if largely academic in method or content, compatible with the mores of academic life? and (2) Is the activity, if not academic in method or content, better done by the campus than by any other alternate agency? If the answer is 'no' in specific cases to either question, we believe there is a prima facie case for disengagement."

The problem of "institutional overloading" was
(Continued on page 5)

Coalition Urging New NAS Study of Auto Emissions

In a surprising reversal of attitude, a small group of influential legislators and little-known public interest advocates is trying to pressure the Environmental Protection Agency into funding further study by the National Academy of Sciences of the automobile emissions problem.

Under a contract that expires on June 30, the Academy has been advising the EPA and Congress on whether it is technologically feasible for the automobile industry to meet the emissions standards mandated by the 1970 Clean Air Act amendments. It has issued two major reports which have been critical of the industry's efforts but which have generally supported the desirability

CARNEGIE (continued from page 4)

deemed especially severe at the big research-oriented universities, with their numerous service activities and advanced training programs. This fact led the Commission to warn against the recent trend for institutions to pattern themselves on the multipurpose research university. "The research university should not become the one and only preferred type," the Commission said. "It should be viewed, instead, as a special type with limited applicability . . . We strongly favor differentiation of functions and specialization of tasks among institutions."

In another section, the report criticized as "quite shortsighted" the recent federal reductions in funds available for basic research in the universities. "These funds are an excellent investment in the long-run future of the United States and in the welfare of the people more generally," it said. The report recommended that federal research funds expended within higher education be maintained steadily at a level of about 0.3 per cent of the gross national product. And it took an elitist view that funds for basic research should be concentrated on the best institutions and individuals rather than dispersed geographically. It recommended that applied research funds be subject to periodic reassessment to reflect the decline of old and the rise of new potentialities.

In the service area, the report complained that "service by higher education in the distribution of useful information and advice, historically, has been directed more toward power and toward money than an even-handed policy would warrant. Agriculture and industry and the professions and the federal government have all been able to obtain substantial service, in the form of applied research and consulting advice, from faculty members. Trade unions were for a long time neglected; so were the cities; so, now, are many voluntary agencies and groups."

of granting the industry a one-year extension of the deadline for meeting the standards.

Now the Academy wants to broaden its study to go into such matters as the health effects of automotive air pollution and the scientific basis for setting the standards. EPA refused to fund such a study last year on the grounds that it lay outside the scope of the work assigned to the Academy under the Clean Air Act.

This year the Academy has picked up influential backing from Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D-Maine), chairman of the Senate subcommittee on air and water pollution, and his committee colleague, Sen. James L. Buckley (R-N.Y.). The two senators wrote a joint letter to EPA on May 17 urging that the Academy's contract be extended and expanded to include such topics as whether the industry is pursuing the optimal technology and how well emissions control devices have performed in actual use since 1968, as well as the health effects question. Similarly, Rep. Paul G. Rogers (D-Fla.), chairman of the House subcommittee on public health and environment, wrote to EPA on May 21 calling it "essential" that the Academy's contract be renewed. The Public Interest Campaign, a citizen group headed by a former Nader associate, John Esposito, has called it "premature" to end the Academy's investigation.

The support now forming behind the Academy is a bit surprising in view of the fact that Muskie was originally cool to the idea of giving the Academy a role in carrying out the Clean Air Act; the Muskie subcommittee, especially Sen. Thomas Eagleton (D-Mo.), gave the Academy representatives such rough treatment last year that they came close to walking out in a huff; and the public interest groups have been sniping at the Academy's performance off and on.

What seems to have happened is that many clean air advocates have concluded that the Academy, whatever its imperfections, is their best hope for a sound decision on the emissions issue. As the Public Interest Campaign expressed it: "The Academy's performance to date . . . has not been 'Grade A.' However, the Academy is potentially the public's last line of technological defense left against the automakers' never-ending claims that the job cannot be done."

Some clean air advocates believe that an Academy study of the health effects basis for setting the emissions standards would head off any tendency by EPA to weaken the standards. But they may be surprised. The main reason the Academy tried to study the health question last year was a belief that at least one of the standards—that for carbon monoxide—is too stringent.

If the Boss Calls, Be Sure to Get His Name

With upper-level employment in the Nixon administration a dubious distinction these days, SGR cannot vouch for the durability of the following roster of top R&D officials throughout the federal establishment, but together they make up that sub-cabinet of science known as the Federal Council for Science and Technology, and for the purpose of knowing who's in charge of what at the moment, it's the best guide available:

Chairman (Acting), H. Guyford Stever, director, National Science Foundation, and newly designated federal Science Advisor;

Executive Director, Daniel V. de Simone;

Agriculture, Robert W. Long, assistant secretary, conservation, research, and education;

AEC, Dixy Lee Ray, chairman;

Commerce, Betsy Ancker-Johnson, assistant secretary, science and technology;

Defense, Malcolm R. Currie, director (designate) research and engineering;

HEW, Charles C. Edwards, assistant secretary, health;

HUD, Michael H. Moskow, assistant secretary, policy development and research;

Interior, Laurence E. Lynn, assistant secretary, program development and budget;

NASA, George M. Low, deputy administrator;

State, Herman Pollack, director, Bureau of International Scientific and Technological Affairs;

Transportation, Robert H. Cannon, Jr., assistant secretary, systems development and technology.

Nine other agencies are accorded observer status at the Council, but according to insiders, they rarely attend, with the exception of Hugh F. Loweth, assistant chief for general science, Office of Management and Budget. It is said that he regularly shows up and is regarded with deference, both for his extensive knowledge of federal R&D affairs but probably more so because OMB holds the checkbook.

As for the future of the FCST—that's a matter of some uncertainty. When Nixon announced plans to abolish the White House Office of Science and Technology (OST), it was generally assumed that OST's various satellites, FCST among them, would also disappear on execution day, June 30, the end of the current fiscal year. Such was the understanding of the heir to many of OST's functions, NSF Director Stever, who told a press briefing in January that "on July 1, the FCST will cease to exist," and will be replaced by a Science Council

Advisory Committee Act Surfaces a Hidden Committee

One of the better byproducts of the Federal Advisory Committee Act which went into effect this year is that it makes known the existence of advisory bodies that previously remained hidden in the crevices of the sprawling US government. It does this by requiring that before any advisory committee may meet, announcement of the meeting must be published in the *Federal Register*, and a reason must be stated if the meeting is closed to the public.

From this process we are now apprised of the existence of a group of scientists and engineers who help the Defense Department's Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff determine which targets get demolished in what order if nuclear war breaks out. This counsel is provided by the Planning Staff's Scientific Advisory Group, which as of last December 31, consisted of 13 members, all drawn from industrial executive positions, government contract laboratories, or the military services.

The members are: Arthur T. Biehl, Research & Development Associates, Inc.; James R. Burnett, TRW; Welko E. Gasich, Northrop Corp.; Peter H. Haas, Defense Nuclear Agency; Charles M. Johnson, SAFEGUARD System Office; Lt. Gen. Glenn A. Kent, Weapons Systems Evaluation Group; Vice Adm. Robert L. J. Long, Submarine Force, US Atlantic Fleet; Charles A. McDonald, Livermore; Dominic A. Paolucci, Lulejian & Associates, Inc.; Fred A. Payne, Martin Marietta (chairman); Joseph F. Shea, Raytheon; Richard L. Wagner, Livermore, and Nils F. Wikner, Defense Research and Engineering.

that Stever would create to assist him in his role of Science Advisor.

Well, as it turns out, the FCST has a legal existence apart from OST, having been created by a 1959 Executive Order that was untouched by the Executive Order abolishing OST.

However, since the FCST has always been more of a theory than a functioning body, it can be confidently stated that the oversight has no effect on the real world. Call it FCST or Science Council, it doesn't matter. Nevertheless, as Stever moves into the role of Science Advisor, it's just possible that he may stick with the FCST format, which calls for the government's top science advisor to serve as Council chairman. The likelihood of this happening is rendered all the greater by the present-day difficulty of getting the White House to pay attention to minor organizational matters.

New Commerce Office to Study World Technology Trends

The foggy debate over whether the US could profit from withholding technological information from foreign competitors may derive some clarity from a forthcoming study aimed at identifying technological trends in the files of the US Patent Office.

The study is the first task assigned to a newly established Department of Commerce Office of Technology Assessment and Forecast, which is to be headed by Alfred C. Marmor, who was previously in charge of systems development at the Patent Office. He will report to Betsy Ancker-Johnson, assistant secretary of Commerce for science and technology, who in announcing the Office and study May 30, noted that a near doubling in the past decade of US patents issued to inventors abroad provides an opportunity for examining technological trends in many other nations. The increase in foreign-held patents has been from 17 per cent to 31 per cent of all US patents issued.

The object of the study, it was stated, will be to "provide early warning of technological areas exhibiting unusually rapid growth; (and) to distinguish those areas in which a high proportion of US patent activity is of foreign origin."

The study comes at a time when a low-level but growing debate is going on inside the administration concerning the economic effects of international trade in technology. One school of thought, well supported by elements of organized labor, holds that the US is exporting jobs when it exports technological know-how to countries with lower labor costs. Industries engaged in such practices respond that the US benefits from the profits that such enterprises return here, and that the domestic job loss is more than compensated for by jobs created to provide supporting services for the foreign operations.

Until the most recent dollar crisis, administration officials regarded the debate as interesting but far from rating serious attention. However, with

Treasury Creates Energy Post

William Johnson, an economist formerly with the Council of Economic Advisers and the Rand Corp., has been appointed to head a newly established Office of the Energy Adviser in the Treasury Department. Johnson will report to Deputy Secretary William E. Simon, who is chairman of the President's Oil Policy Committee.

NSF Budget Testimony Available

With NSF galloping off in all directions these days, those who want the official word on where it says its going, how, and why, are referred to the just-published transcript of NSF's House appropriations hearings. Some 575 pages worth can be obtained without charge by writing to the Appropriations Committee, US House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., and requesting Part 2, HUD-Space-Science Appropriations, Hearings, for 1974.

technology coming to be regarded as one of the US's most valuable assets in international affairs, the case for "technological protectionism" (SGR Vol. II, No. 12) is no longer regarded as a far-fetched option.

Politically, the only real question is whether we can pull it off without serious retribution from our trading partners, and the new patent study may put some light on that.

SGR Summer Schedule

The next two issues of *Science & Government Report* will be published July 15 and August 15, respectively, after which the regular twice-monthly schedule will be resumed.

Science & Government Report
Kalorama Station
Box 21123B
Washington, D.C. 20009

- ☐ Renew my subscription
☐ Enter my subscription

for ☐ two years, \$65; or ☐ one year, \$35
(Overseas airmail, \$10 additional per year.)

☐ check enclosed; ☐ please bill.

☐ Send a complimentary copy to:

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

OTA Hit By Congressional Staff Salary Limit

The latest misfortune to befall the legislated but unlaunched congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) is a Senate decision to cut the salary of its still-unselected director from the originally planned \$40,000 a year to \$36,000.

The reduction reflects no antagonism to OTA. Rather, the quest for an appropriation for OTA happened to come along at a time when Congress is determined to increase the monetary space between its own salary level, \$42,500 per member, and those of its staff employees. Toward this goal, the House last year adopted a resolution limiting future staff salaries to a maximum of \$36,000. When the \$3 billion supplemental appropriations bill—containing \$289,000 for startup money for OTA—came along last month, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield successfully introduced an amendment to bring the Senate into line with the House on the salary issue.

The pay cut is not expected to affect the intention of Emilio Q. Daddario, the former Connecticut congressman who long ago fathered the OTA legislation, to accept an offer to be OTA's first director. But at this point, there is still no certainty as to when OTA will receive the funds that it needs to come into being. The supplemental bill contains a prohibition against further bombing of Cambodia, and is almost a certain candidate for a presidential veto. Meanwhile, an attempt is also being made to obtain a regular appropriation of \$3.5 million in a Legislative Appropriations bill, but that measure remains hung up on a House-Senate squabble over extending the West front of the Capitol. For reasons that defy understanding, the House

has traditionally favored the extension and the Senate has long been opposed.

After creation of an OTA was authorized last year, Senator Kennedy moved rapidly to become chairman of its 12-member congressional board, leading to various reports, most prominently in the *Wall Street Journal*, that he planned to devote its 50-member staff to his presidential ambitions. That speculation need not be written off as incredible, but the chairmanship is on a two-year alternating basis between each house, and whatever Kennedy's designs may be, nearly half of his tenure has elapsed with OTA existing only on paper.

Arms Control Report Published

The 12th annual report of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is available for 65 cents from the US Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. With ACDA rapidly sinking from a massive cut in its budget and dismissal of most of its top staff, the 65-page annual report may well be the last. The report reviews arms control negotiations during 1972, contains the text of the SALT agreement, and, of particular value, contains a nation-by-nation tabulation of positions on 14 major arms control agreements in effect since 1959.

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT, ©1973 by Science & Government Report, Inc. All rights reserved. Daniel S. Greenberg, Publisher; Philip M. Boffey, Managing Editor; Kay Boffey, Circulation Manager. Published 22 times per year at 1629 Columbia Road, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009. Subscription rate, \$35 a year; overseas airmail subscription, \$45. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. Vol. III, No 12, June 15, 1973.

Science & Government Report
Kalorama Station
Box 21123
Section B
Washington, D.C. 20009

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

NEWSLETTER—

Please expedite delivery directly to addressee

